

From: [Wood, Nicole](#)
To: [Saric, James](#)
Cc: [Carlson, Janet](#)
Subject: RE: April 3rd Meeting Summary and Proposed Conference Call
Date: Monday, April 15, 2013 1:53:12 PM

I like your suggestion about sending them an email noting that there are inaccuracies and underscoring that EPA is not approving/disapproving or agreeing with their statements.

From: Saric, James
Sent: Monday, April 15, 2013 1:37 PM
To: Wood, Nicole; Carlson, Janet
Subject: RE: April 3rd Meeting Summary and Proposed Conference Call

I am out of the office on Thursday and Friday. They are probably trying to document this because the dispute resolution tolling period ends Sunday. Maybe an email as simple as telling them that their letter is fairly accurate but EPA believes there are some incorrect statements that we could discuss when we have a call to discuss their remaining concerns. Also, that EPA does not typically produce such minutes of meetings and we do not approve/disapprove such minutes. Just a thought, as I am sure they would like some response by next week. However, since this is really just minutes from a meeting and if you think we need to correct their inconsistencies, then we should send them a letter and we can do that next week.

Jim

From: Wood, Nicole
Sent: Monday, April 15, 2013 1:28 PM
To: Saric, James; Carlson, Janet
Subject: RE: April 3rd Meeting Summary and Proposed Conference Call

Hi, Jim.

I think we should respond either by email or in a letter. I too found some their account not to be wholly accurate.

I typically don't like documenting meetings with minutes either. I imagine that they sent this along because of the recent misunderstandings regarding the ASTM.

I am tied up in meetings most of the day tomorrow and out on Wednesday, so let's pick this up on Thursday if you are in.

Thanks.

Nicole

From: Saric, James
Sent: Monday, April 15, 2013 11:33 AM

To: Wood, Nicole; Carlson, Janet
Subject: FW: April 3rd Meeting Summary and Proposed Conference Call

So, what do we do with a letter like this. I would say their responses are not totally accurate, but I don't like documenting meetings with such minutes, etc. Do we have to send a letter back or can we remain silent on this? They also want to set up a meeting to discuss some other issues. I'll them to take the lead on setting up a meeting.

Feel free to give me a call on how to respond. This is actually the first time GP has submitted anything like this.

Jim

From: Fortenberry, Chase [<mailto:LCFORTEN@GAPAC.com>]
Sent: Friday, April 12, 2013 1:26 PM
To: Saric, James
Cc: Wood, Nicole; BUCHOLTZP@michigan.gov; SynkP@michigan.gov; Davis, Michael (GP Law); Lathrop, Alison J. (GP LAW); Griffith, Garry T.; Massengill, Dave G.; Garret Bondy
Subject: April 3rd Meeting Summary and Proposed Conference Call

Jim,

The attached letter documents Georgia-Pacific's understanding of the discussions we had during our meeting in Chicago last week. Please let us know if it is alignment with your takeaways from the meeting.

We would also like to propose a follow up conference call to discuss several additional comments that we were not able to get to during the meeting. In an effort to capitalize on our remaining time, I suggest we schedule this as early next week as possible.

Please let us know your availability for a call.

Thanks,

L. Chase Fortenberry, P.G.

Manager - Environmental Engineering
Georgia-Pacific LLC
133 Peachtree St., NE
Atlanta, GA 30303
Office #: (404) 652-6166
Mobile #: (404) 539-3509
lcforten@gapac.com